



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,484	07/21/2005	Yoshihisa Nishibe	26430U	5312

34375 7590 12/18/2007
NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PALENIK, JEFFREY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/519,484	NISHIBE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey T. Palenik	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>24 Feb 2005 & 25 Aug 2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 November 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-3 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that the special technical feature between Group I, the product, and Group II, the method of manufacturing the product, is the "ciclesonide-containing sterile aqueous suspension" comprising "sterilization by autoclaving". This is not found persuasive because the claims of Group I are directed toward the composition itself rather than a method for achieving said composition. Per MPEP 2113, the patentability of product-by-process claims, though limited and defined by a process, is determined on the basis of the product itself. "The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production". The fact that the composition is sterilized by autoclaving is irrelevant with regard to the final product.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 4-9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (lack of unity) requirement between the product and method of manufacturing.

The remaining claims 1-3 are presented and represent all claims under consideration.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it refers to methods directed to non-elected subject matter. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karlsson et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0065256).

Claim 1 is drawn to a composition of matter comprising a ciclesonide-containing sterile aqueous suspension. Claim 2 further limits the composition of claim 1 by requiring that the composition also contain hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC). The composition is taught by Karlsson et al. at claims 7, 9, and 10. Claim 10 teaches a thickening agent which is further defined as including hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (see [0040] and [0041]).

Therefore each and every limitation is met by the reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0065256) in view of the Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for Metolose 60SH.

Karlsson et al. teaches the ciclesonide and HPMC suspension, as described above. However, Karlsson does not teach the specific grade of HPMC (HPMC 2910) as cited in claim 3. Per Applicant's specification, the claimed HPMC 2910 is also known industrially as Metolose 60SH. Shin-Etsu Co. produces the HPMC of the present invention and provides an MSDS which further provides a Recommended Use for Metolose 60SH as a thickening agent. Therefore,

Since the ingredient of the composition is the chemically the same, it follows that particular grade of HPMC used is a result-effective parameter that a person having

ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to employ the optimal grade hydroxypropyl methylcellulose within the composition in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, optimization of this ingredient would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention.

No claims are allowed.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey T. Palenik whose telephone number is (571) 270-1966. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 5:00 pm; M-F (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Application/Control Number:
10/519,484
Art Unit: 1615

Page 6

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey T. Palenik
Patent Examiner


MICHAEL P. WOODWARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600